

REMARKS

Claims 84-119 remain in the present application. Claims 84-85, 87-91, 93, 96-97, 99-103, 105, 108-109, 111-115 and 117 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 84-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the rejection states that several claim limitations contain new matter. However, Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that Claims 84-119 do not contain new matter for reasons set forth below.

The limitation "an active display screen" has been removed from Claims 84, 96 and 108 and replaced with "selected display screen." The term "selected display screen" may be supported by, for example, lines 6-8 of page 5.

The limitation "transition" as recited in Claim 89 may be supported by, for example, lines 20-22 of page 4, lines 20-24 of page 5, lines 4-6 of page 6, etc. For example, lines 20-24 of page 5 state: "[t]his may be achieved by the user clicking the mouse button and dragging the cursor effectively so it appears to pass from one screen to the other screen with an image (say a line) appearing to provide a visual bridge between the front screen and another screen or screens in the background." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cursor passing from one screen to another provides support for transitioning display of a

graphical object from one display screen to another display screen as recited in Claims 89, 101, and 113.

The limitation "second input" may be supported by, for example, lines 16-17 of page 3, lines 21-22 of page 3, lines 9-11 of page 4, lines 19-20 of page 4, lines 21-23 of page 5, etc. For example, where a mouse is the user interface component as described in lines 19-24 of page 4, "a particular mouse button" (e.g., the first input) may cause a visual indicator (e.g., displayed cursor) to move from one display screen to another. A second input (e.g., movement of the mouse) may cause the displayed cursor to move on the active or selected display screen.

The limitation "adjusting" may be supported by, for example, lines 16-17 of page 3, lines 21-22 of page 3, lines 16-17 of page 3, line 1 of page 5 to line 7 of page 6, etc. For example, in the above example where the user interface component is a mouse, the mouse may be moved to change the position of the cursor on the screen. As such, the displayed cursor is adjusted (e.g., displayed in a different location on the display screen) in response to a second input (e.g., movement of the mouse).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 84-119 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 84-119 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejections of record.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 84-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, the rejection states on page 4 that various terms are indefinite because the specification does not redefine them.

As noted on page 3 of the rejection, a term need only be redefined by the specification where the term is used contrary to its ordinary meaning in the specification. However, Applicants respectfully submit that all terms listed on page 4 of the rejection are not used in the specification contrary to their ordinary meanings. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification need not redefine the terms. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 84-119 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections of record.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 84-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,246,407 to Wilks et al. (hereafter referred to as "Wilks"). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 84-119 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilks for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 84 that recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

a multi-component display comprising:
a first display screen; and
a second display screen overlapping said first display
screen; and

a user interface component for selecting at least one display screen for responding to an input, and wherein said at least one selected display screen comprises a display screen selected from a group consisting of said first and second display screens.

Independent Claims 96 and 108 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 84. Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a first display screen" and "a second display screen overlapping said first display screen" as recited in independent Claim 84. As recited and described in the present application, a multi-component display comprises a first display screen and a second display screen, where the second display screen overlaps said first display screen.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Wilks to teach a *single* computer screen 10 as shown in Figures 1-3 of Wilks. Applicants respectfully assert that a single computer screen as taught by Wilks is not a multi-component display comprising *multiple* display screens, for example as shown in Figures 1a-3b of the present application, and as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a first display screen" and "a second display screen overlapping said first display screen" as recited in independent Claim 84.

Although page 4 of the rejection suggests that the windows (e.g., 14, 26, etc.) displayed on Wilks' computer screen 10 are display screens as claimed, Applicants respectfully assert that the windows are merely graphical objects on the *single* display screen 10. Applicants further assert that graphical objects displayed on a display screen are not a display screen capable of displaying

graphical objects. Moreover, Wilks makes this distinction clear by teaching that the multiple windows are all displayed on the single computer screen 10 (Abstract; Figures 1-5; col. 2, lines 31-39), and further that the windows are "graphical user interface objects" (col. 2, lines 38-39).

Applicants respectfully assert that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a user interface component for selecting at least one display screen" and "wherein said at least one selected display screen comprises a display screen selected from a group consisting of said first and second display screens" as recited in independent Claim 84. As recited and described in the present application, a user interface component is operable to select at least one display screen of a multi-component display, where the multi-component display comprises a first display screen and a second display screen which overlap one another.

As discussed above, Wilks fails to teach multiple overlapping display screens as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Wilks also fails to teach or suggest selecting a display screen from the multiple overlapping display screens as claimed. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that Wilks fails to teach or suggest a user interface component for selecting the display screen as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a user interface component for selecting at least one display screen" and "wherein said at least one selected display screen comprises a display screen selected from a group consisting of said first and second display screens" as recited in independent Claim 84.

Applicants respectfully assert that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said user interface component is further for enabling selection of said at least one display screen in response to a sound" as recited in Claim 88, and similarly recited in Claims 100 and 112. As recited and described in the present application, a user interface component is operable to enable selection of a display screen in response to a sound.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Wilks of a user interface component which is operable to enable selection of a display screen in response to a sound as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said user interface component is further for enabling selection of said at least one display screen in response to a sound" as recited in Claim 88, and similarly recited in Claims 100 and 112.

Further, Applicants respectfully disagree that a video game inherently has sound as stated on page 5 of the rejection. Moreover, even assuming *arguendo* that a video game produces sound as suggested by the rejection, producing sound is not the same as selecting a display screen *in response to* a sound (e.g., a voice, etc.) as claimed. Thus, Applicants reiterate that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said user interface component is further for enabling selection of said at least one display screen in response to a sound" as recited in Claim 88, and similarly recited in Claims 100 and 112.

Applicants respectfully assert that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said user interface component is operable to transition a display of a graphical object to said at least one selected display screen" as

recited in Claim 89, and similarly recited in Claims 101 and 113. As recited and described in the present application, a user interface component is operable to transition a display of a graphical object to a selected display screen.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Wilks to teach changing the appearance of a displayed window by transitioning the displayed window from one state to another (col. 4, lines 31-37). However, Applicants respectfully submit that changing the appearance of a window displayed on a single display screen is not the same as transitioning a displayed graphical object *from one display screen to another* as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said user interface component is operable to transition a display of a graphical object to said at least one selected display screen” as recited in Claim 89, and similarly recited in Claims 101 and 113.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 84 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilks. Since independent Claims 96 and 108 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 84, independent Claims 96 and 108 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilks. Since dependent Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilks. Thus, Claims 84-119 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of record, and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 84-119 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Please direct all future correspondence to the below address:

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 1/11, 2008

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060